



03-23-06

EPW 2.6.65.

## AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Docket No.  
68144/P007US/10501224Application No.  
10/010,935-Conf. #9271Filing Date  
December 5, 2001Examiner  
H. D. VuArt Unit  
2665

Applicant(s): David Prager et al.

Invention: WIRELESS COMMUNICATION SUBSYSTEM WITH A DIGITAL INTERFACE

## TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application.

The fee has been calculated and is transmitted as shown below.

CLAIMS AS AMENDED					
	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number Previously Paid	Number Extra Claims Present	Rate	
Total Claims	47	- 61 =		x	
Independent Claims	2	- 4 =		x	
Multiple Dependent Claims (check if applicable) <input type="checkbox"/>					
Other fee (please specify):					
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT:					0.00

☐ Large Entity☒ Small Entity☒ No additional fee is required for this amendment.☐ Please charge Deposit Account No. \_\_\_\_\_ in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_.  
A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.☐ A check in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ to cover the filing fee is enclosed.☐ Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. 06-2380  
as described below.☒ Credit any overpayment.☒ Charge any additional filing or application processing fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17.R. Ross Viguet  
Attorney/Agent Reg. No.: 42,203Dated: March 22, 2006FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784  
(214) 855-8386

## Amendment Transmittal

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV568259843US, on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to:  
MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Dated: March 22, 2006

Signature: Phyllis Ewing (Phyllis Ewing)



Docket No.: 68144/P007US/10501224  
(PATENT)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:  
David Prager et al.

Application No.: 10/010,935

Confirmation No.: 9271

Filed: December 5, 2001

Art Unit: 2665

For: WIRELESS COMMUNICATION SUBSYSTEM Examiner: H. D. Vu  
WITH A DIGITAL INTERFACE

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

MS Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action mailed February 27, 2006 (Paper No. 20060213), applicant hereby provisionally elects Group I, claims 1-47, for continued examination, with traverse. The Examiner has required restriction between claims 1-47, as Group I, and claims 48-61, as Group II, and has asserted that Group I does not contain the fiber optic coupling of Group II. The Examiner has stated that Groups I and II are related, but that they require different fields of search.

To support a requirement for restriction between two or more related product inventions, or between two or more related process inventions, both two-way distinctness and reasons for insisting on restriction are necessary. M.P.E.P. § 806.05(j). For other related product inventions, or related process inventions, the inventions are distinct if (A) the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; (B) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and (C) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. *Id.* Where the related inventions as claimed are shown to be independent or distinct under the criteria of MPEP § 806.05(c) - § 806.06, the Examiner, in order to establish reasons